REMARKS

[0001]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-23 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 7, and 14.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0002]   If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0003]   Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0004]   Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 7 and 14 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and

should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited reference.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 102

[0005]   Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102.   In light of the amendments presented herein Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0006]   Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0007]   The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following reference alone:

- **Kramer:** *Kramer,* US Patent Publication No. 2003/0182392 (Published September 25, 2003).

Cited References

[0008] The Examiner cites Kramer as the primary reference in the anticipation rejections.

Kramer

[0009] Kramer describes a technology for publishing applications to a single Web service directory.

Anticipation Rejections

[0010] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.[1] Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.[2]

Based upon Kramer

[0011] The Examiner rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kramer. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims. Based on the reasons given below, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

---

[1] "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); also see MPEP §2131.

[2] See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Amended Independent Claims 1, 11, and 16

[0012] Applicant submits that Kramer does not anticipate these amended claims because Kramer does not disclose the following elements or features as recited in these claims as currently amended (in part and with emphasis added):

> **"discovering,** by the Web service, **information provided by an information source**, the information corresponding to at least one application deployed on the Intranet, the discovering comprising **querying all application information sources known to the web servic**e, the at least one application being configured for subsequent terminal server (TS) based access to an application hosting server for a user of a remote client computer, the remote computer being external to the Intranet; "

[0013] Kramer discusses the publishing of an application to a single web service and the subsequent querying of that same web service by a client in order to receive the application information available from that web service. The web service discussed by Kramer provides information for connecting to the applications published to that service. Hence, the Examiner seems to be equating the Web service discussed by Kramer with the information source as recited in claims 1, 7 and 14.

[0014] The "Web service" recited in the claims is distinct from information sources as it does not itself comprise any information regarding applications. Kramer's Web service queries applications while the recited Web Service queries information sources. Therefore, the Web service discussed by Kramer is not equivalent to the Web Service recited in the claims.

Consequently, Kramer does not disclose all of the elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections from these claims.

Dependent Claims

[0015]   In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0016]   All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.   If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action**.   Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Clay D. Hagler/ RegNo. 61,804   Dated: 20 February 2009
Clay D. Hagler (clay@leehayes.com; 509.944.4723)
Registration No. 61,804
John Meline (JohnM@leehayes.com 509.944.4757)
Registration No. 58,280

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com